



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,274	03/10/2004	Paul Rich	WLJ.103	9386

20987 7590 09/28/2006

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, & WHITT PLLC  
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE  
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE SUITE 1260  
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

ESTRADA, MICHELLE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2823

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/796,274

Applicant(s)

RICH ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle Estrada

Art Unit

2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,10,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,10,13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/06, 1/13/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The indication of allowance to claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 is withdrawn in view of references found during an updated search before allowance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kado (2003/0150713).

Re claim 1, Kado discloses a method of sputtering a tungsten film from a tungsten target onto a semiconductor wafer including using krypton as a sputter gas (Abstract), wherein the resistivity of the tungsten film is less than 11 $\mu$ ohm cm, the resistivity is an inherent property, since the same materials are treated in the same manner as the claim, then the resistivity recited would be obtained.

Re claim 7, Kado discloses a method of sputtering a tungsten film from a tungsten target onto a semiconductor wafer including using krypton as a sputter gas (Abstract), wherein the platen is negatively biased ([0022]).

Re claim 9, Kado discloses wherein the sputter gases further include argon (Abstract).

Re claim 10, Kado discloses wherein the ratio of argon to krypton is selected to minimize stress in the deposited film.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kado as applied to claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 above, and further in view of the following comments.

Re claims 2, 3, 5 and 6, One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to the recited pressure, power and temperature through routine experimentation to achieve a desired device dimension, device associated characteristics and device density on the finished wafer.

In addition, the selection of pressure, power and temperature, its obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process conditions by routine experimentation with a limited number of species of result effective variables. These claims are prima facie obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve

Art Unit: 2823

unexpected results relative to the prior art range. In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges or a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill or art) and In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1995) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed pressure, power and temperature or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen pressure, power and temperature or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen pressure, power and temperature are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kado as applied to claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 above, and further in view of Taguwa (6,800,543) in view of Matsumoto et al. (6,451,690).

Kado does not disclose forming a tungsten/tungsten nitride stack on a wafer including sputtering tungsten nitride film on a wafer and sputtering a tungsten film on the

Art Unit: 2823

tungsten nitride film wherein the two sputtering processes are performed in a single chamber using a single target.

Taguwa discloses a method of forming a tungsten/tungsten nitride (16/17) stack on a wafer including sputtering a tungsten nitride film (16) on a wafer and sputtering a tungsten film (17) on the tungsten nitride film (Col. 5, lines 1-65); wherein the tungsten nitride film is deposited by reactive sputtering and the sputter gases include nitrogen (Col. 5, lines 20-32).

Taguwa does not specifically disclose wherein the two sputtering processes are performed in a single chamber using a single target.

Matsumoto et al. disclose a method of forming metal film by sputtering method; wherein the metal films can be continuously formed by using the same target placed in the same chamber by merely changing the kind of gas to be used for the sputtering (Col. 5, lines 33-36).

It would have been within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kado, Taguwa and Matsumoto et al. to use the same target and chamber in the sputtering processes of Matsumoto et al. to be performed in the process of Taguwa because using the same target placed in the same chamber improves the throughput.

Re claim 15, the combination of Kado, Taguwa and Matsumoto et al. as explained above, forms a gate structure by the method of claim 13.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kado as applied to claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 above, and further in view of Taguwa (6,800,543) in view of Matsumoto et al. (6,451,690).

With respect to claim 14, Taguwa discloses a method of forming a tungsten/tungsten nitride (16/17) stack on a wafer including sputtering a tungsten nitride film (16) on a wafer and sputtering a tungsten film (17) on the tungsten nitride film (Col. 5, lines 1-65); wherein the tungsten nitride film is deposited by reactive sputtering and the sputter gases include nitrogen (Col. 5, lines 20-32).

Taguwa does not specifically disclose wherein the two sputtering processes are performed in a single chamber using a single target.

Matsumoto et al. disclose a method of forming metal film by sputtering method; wherein the metal films can be continuously formed by using the same target placed in the same chamber by merely changing the kind of gas to be used for the sputtering (Col. 5, lines 33-36).

It would have been within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Taguwa and Matsumoto et al. to use the same target and chamber in the sputtering processes of Matsumoto et al. to be performed in the process of Taguwa because using the same target placed in the same chamber improves the throughput.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Estrada whose telephone number is 571-272-1858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Michelle Estrada  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2823